### Agenda Item



2012 OCT 10 AM 10: 26

tem 29

**ASR Control** 12-001448

MEETING DATE:

10/16/12

AGENDA STAFF REPORT

LEGAL ENTITY TAKING ACTION:

**Board of Supervisors** 

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DISTRICT(S):** 

All Districts

SUBMITTING AGENCY/DEPARTMENT:

County Executive Office (Approved)

**DEPARTMENT CONTACT PERSON(S):** 

Bob Franz (714) 834-4304

Mahesh Patel (714) 834-2525

**SUBJECT:** IT Sourcing Recommendations

CEO CONCUR Concur COUNTY COUNSEL REVIEW

CLERK OF THE BOARD

N/A

Discussion 3 Votes Board Majority

**Budgeted: N/A** 

Current Year Cost: N/A

Annual Cost: N/A

**Staffing Impact:** Yes

# of Positions:

Sole Source: N/A

Current Fiscal Year Revenue: N/A

Funding Source: N/A

Prior Board Action: 10/4/11

# **RECOMMENDED ACTION(S):**

1. Approve the IT Sourcing Executive Committee's recommendation to enter into negotiations with SAIC as the primary and Xerox as the secondary vendor for Scope 1 services.

- 2. Approve the IT Sourcing Executive Committee's recommendation to enter into negotiations with Xerox as the primary and Verizon as the secondary vendor for Scope 2 services.
- 3. Direct the CEO to return to the Board with final negotiated contract(s) for approval by the Board.

### **SUMMARY:**

On February 2, 2010 your Board authorized the development of a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a managed services contract for Information Technology services that are provided through CEO/IT via the current staff augmentation contract with Xerox State and Local Solutions. The Board also authorized the inclusion of requirements for a Countywide converged voice and data network in the same RFP. The RFP process has been underway and final evaluations have been completed. Results of the evaluations were presented to the Source Selection Committee which made recommendations to the IT Sourcing Executive Committee. This Committee concurs with their recommendations as follows:

- -- Select SAIC as the primary and Xerox as the secondary vendor to enter into negotiations for Scope 1 services.
- -- Select Xerox as the primary and Verizon as the secondary vendor to enter into negotiations for Scope 2 services.

We are requesting your Board's approval to proceed with final negotiations with the primary vendors mentioned above and we plan to return to your Board with a final contract(s) in mid-December 2012.

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

On February 2, 2010 your Board authorized the development of a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a managed services contract for Information Technology services that are provided through CEO/IT via the current staff augmentation contract with Xerox State and Local Solutions. The Board also authorized the inclusion of requirements for a Countywide converged voice and data network in the same RFP.

The original ten year term of the County's contract with Xerox expired in June 2011 and has been extended through February 19, 2013, with an additional optional extension through June 19, 2013. The County is seeking a new IT sourcing service delivery model, which is critical in light of the following business drivers and the <u>objectives</u> behind this model:

- -- Necessary infrastructure upgrades
- -- Opportunity for Countywide assessment of IT service delivery, lowering cost, and improving services
- -- County's severe economic pressure
- -- Leverage current IT sourcing models there have been dramatic improvements in the last 10 years in how IT services are delivered
- -- Board of Supervisors' expectations of cost-justified IT

The established sourcing strategy goals include:

- -- Improved service delivery
- -- Guaranteed service levels
- -- Timely technology refresh and legacy system renewal
- -- Maximum resource flexibility
- -- Innovation (continuous improvement)
- -- Increased cost efficiencies

The RFP included two separate scopes of work. Scope 1 includes Data Center Operations, Service Desk, Desktop Support and Applications Services. In addition to CEO/IT, four other Agencies have shown interest and have been included in Scope 1 for pricing. Scope 2 includes Countywide Voice and Data Network. This scope proposes to transform the County from its current end-of-life voice system with separate data network lines to a converged voice and data network infrastructure with Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) capabilities.

Vendors were allowed to bid on either scope or both scopes. In addition, they will be required to provide all services within the United States and services must be staffed by U.S. located resources. Finally,

vendors had the option of providing services through the Orange County Data Center, from their own facilities located within the U.S., or a combination thereof.

### **RFP Development**

Following your Board's direction, RFP development began in February 2010. Over a period of several months CEO/IT held numerous workshops with Agency/Department IT Managers and subject matter experts from CEO/IT to develop the Scopes of Work (SOW). Representatives from Health Care Agency, Social Services Agency, OC Community Resources, District Attorney, Public Defender, Probation, Clerk-Recorder, Auditor-Controller, Assessor, OC Public Works, OC Waste & Recycling and Sheriff's Department assisted in the development of the SOWs. In addition, several full days were dedicated to development of the Voice and Network Scope of Work with assistance from Agency IT managers.

In June 2010, the Board established a Board IT Committee to review the recommendations and findings from the Performance Auditor reports of CEO/IT, before considering release of the RFP. The RFP development process was put on hold until January 2011. On March 1, 2011, the Board authorized the release of the RFP, which was formally released on April 8, 2011. Following release of the RFP the County conducted a Pre-Proposal Conference to answer questions from prospective vendors. The County also made available to the vendors the County Reference Library which included County confidential information such as network diagrams, Standard Operating Procedures, Policies & Procedures, etc. In addition, tours of the Orange County Data Center were provided to prospective vendors. Finally, the County received and responded to almost 600 questions from vendors before the initial proposals were submitted. Proposals were due on June 29, 2011. The County received proposals from six vendors. Four proposed only Scope 1, three proposed only Scope 2 and one proposed both Scopes 1 and 2.

# **Evaluation Process – Initial 6 Vendors (7 Proposals)**

Given the complexity and criticality of the RFP, the proposal evaluation process has been extensive. The evaluation teams were comprised of over 40 County stakeholders from Agencies/Departments and CEO/IT, and non-County entities. These teams were staffed with individuals possessing technical expertise in specific service areas. Additionally, a Source Selection Committee was established, consisting of County and non-County participants, to view the consolidated scoring and recommendations from each technical evaluation team. Furthermore, an IT Sourcing Executive Committee, comprised of County executive management and led by the County Executive Officer, provides oversight.

Beginning immediately after the proposal due date, the evaluation teams began reviewing the proposals. Vendor presentations were held from August 29 – September 7, 2011. After initial review of the written proposals and presentations by vendors, it was apparent that the vendors needed clarification on the voice and data network scope of work. Due to the size and complexity of the County's voice and data network systems, additional clarification efforts (additional information, due diligence by vendors, and question and answer sessions) were made to ensure that the proposed solutions will meet County's current and future needs.

In lieu of down-selecting vendors in November 2011, the decision was made to include all six prospective bidders in the due diligence process and allow them to participate in the Best and Final Offer (BAFO) process. The original schedule was based on the assumption of entering this phase with four vendors (two for Scope 1 and two for Scope 2). This decision provided for a thorough vetting of all six bidders and resulted in a six-month delay in the project due to the additional work.

# Evaluation Process – Best and Final Offer (BAFO)

BAFO instructions were released in February 2012. Following evaluation of the BAFO proposals, in May 2012 the IT Sourcing Executive Committee recommended that the County down-select and proceed with three Vendors for Scope 1 (HP, SAIC and Xerox) and two Vendors for Scope 2 (Verizon and Xerox). (The original plan was to down-select to two vendors for each scope). Additional time was added to the schedule to accommodate the additional vendor in Scope 1 and to complete the final BAFO process—including time to develop negotiation strategies; allowing vendors an additional opportunity to perform due diligence, including visits to County facilities as chosen by vendors; question and answer sessions; detailed discussions with Scope 2 vendors on their proposed solutions; performing preliminary negotiations; and evaluating final BAFO responses. Throughout the entire procurement process the County continued to accept and responded to written questions submitted by vendors. Responses to questions submitted by vendors that pertained to the general technical scope were made available to all vendors. Questions regarding a vendor's specific solution were not shared with other vendors.

# <u>Final Evaluations – 4 Vendors (5 Proposals)</u>

At the end of July 2012, the County released final proposal instructions to vendors. Final proposals were received at the end of August and final evaluations have been completed. Vendor proposals were evaluated on several criteria including:

- -- Completeness, quantifiable benefit to the County and quality of the vendor's proposal
- -- Vendor's ability to deliver services
- -- Vendor's business profile
- -- Range of services offered by the vendor
- -- Solution offering across each service area
- -- Flexibility and creativity offered by vendor
- -- Technical fit
- -- Solution cost
- -- Relationship management approach (governance)
- -- Qualifications of the vendor's proposed team

In addition, the County conducted several reference checks on each vendor to verify that the vendor had successfully provided similar services to other clients. These reference checks were conducted with both government entities (at the federal, state and local level) and private companies.

All vendors proposed using both the Orange County Data Center and vendor facilities located within the United States. Members of the evaluation team conducted on-site meetings at these remote locations to assess first-hand the vendors' facilities, teams, processes and tools. The results of these assessments were factored into the evaluation results.

Results of the evaluations were presented to the Source Selection Committee which made recommendations to the IT Sourcing Executive Committee. This Committee concurs with their recommendations as follows:

- -- Select SAIC as the primary and Xerox as the secondary vendor to enter into negotiations for Scope 1 services.
- -- Select Xerox as the primary and Verizon as the secondary vendor to enter into negotiations for Scope 2 services.

The chart below provides summary scores resulting from the evaluations:

	HP (Scope 1)	SAIC (Scope 1)	Xerox (Scope 1)	Xerox (Scope 2)	Verizon (Scope 2)
Total Weighted Score	299.9	362.7	318.0	359.7	282.2
Rank Number	#3	#1	#2	#1	#2

We are requesting your Board's approval to proceed with final negotiations with the primary vendors mentioned above and plan to return to your Board with a final contract(s) in mid-December 2012.

### FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The County is currently operating on a maintenance basis with the current network and voice system. The Scope 2, Countywide voice and data network scope of work will enable the County to transform from its current end-of-life voice system with separate data network lines, to a converged voice and data network infrastructure with VoIP capabilities. It is expected that the County will need to invest in one-time costs to upgrade to the new infrastructure, which will result in future cost avoidance. Ongoing costs for both Scope 1 and Scope 2 services are anticipated to be in-line with current expenditures. The County intends to provide a comparison of the current cost model with the new contract model after completion of negotiations with the recommended vendors.


## **STAFFING IMPACT:**

It is anticipated that implementation of the new IT Sourcing contract(s) will have an impact on Countywide IT staffing positions. CEO/IT is working in conjunction with the Human Resources Department and County Counsel to mitigate these impacts and to conduct the necessary meet and confer sessions with impacted labor organizations.

# ATTACHMENT(S):

IT Sourcing High Level Process Timeline Evaluation Scoring Sheets

# **IT Sourcing RFP Process Timeline**



- \* **RFP on-hold** pending Board IT Committee's review of Performance Auditor reports on recommendations and findings of CEO/IT.
- \*\* Initial Evaluations included scoring original written proposals, vendor presentations, proposal clarifications and re-scoring efforts.
- \*\*\* Vendor Down-Select to three Scope 1 vendors and two Scope 2 Vendors

OURCING RFP SCORING						and the second s
LBAFO ROUND DUE 8/28/12	ACS 51 FINAL ACS 5	2 FINAL HP S1 FIN	AL SAICS1F			NTC
ion #1 - Vendor Compliance with the RFP Process E	BAFO Round BAFO	Round BAFO Rou	ind BAFO Roi	und BAFO Rout	nd COMME	
1 - Compliance with RFP process/rules	3	3	3	3	3	
uator 1	3	3	3	3	3 200	
uator 2 rage Score	3,00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
nded Score	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
2 - Compliance with RFP timetable	4	4	3	3	3	
uator 1 uator 2	4	4	3	3	3.00	
rage Score	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
nded Score	4.00	4.001	3,00	3.001		
3 - Level of engagement/quality & relevance of questions	3	3	3	3	3.5	
luator 1 luator 2	3	3	3	3 200	3.50	
rage Score	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
inded Scare	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.001	0.001	
e 4 - Compliance with technical proposal format	3	3	3	3	4	
luator 1 luator 2	3	3	3	3	4.00	
rage Score	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	
inded Score	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.001		
e 5 - Compliance with pricing proposal format	3	3	3	3	3	
luator 1 luator 2	3	3	3	3	3.00	
erage Score	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
unded Scare	3.00	j.00]	5.00	3,551		
e 6 - Quality of Proposal responses, answers and additional documentation	3	3	5	5	2.5	
aluator 1	3	3	5	5.00	2.50	
erage Score	3.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	2.50	
unded Score	3.00	3,00	5.00	1		
ne 7 - Proposal Oral Presentation	4	4	4	4.5	4.5	
aluator 1	4	4	4.00	4,5 4.50	4.5 4.50	
erage Score	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.50	
nunded Score	ACS ST FINAL AC	SSZ FINAL HP S1 F	FINAL SAICS	1 FINAL Verizon	SZ FINAL	<u> </u>
ection #2 - Vendor Profile	BAFO Round B/	AFO Round BAFO F		Round BAFO R	ound COM	MENTS
ection #Z - Vendor Profile ne 1 - Vendor Organization Overview				3	31	
raluator 1	3	3	3	3	3	
valuator 2	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
verage Score	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
ounded Score ine 2 - Quality/Use of Subcontractors		-1	251	4	3	
valuator 1	4	4	2.5	4	3	
valuator 2	4.00	4.00	2.50	4,00	3.00	
verage Score	4.00	4.00	2.50	4.00	3.00	
tounded Score Ine 3 - Vendor Business Profile and Strategy	,			.1	-1	
valuator 1	3	3	4	3	2	
valuator 2	3.00	3.00	4,00	3.00	2.00	
Average Score	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	
Rounded Score	1	•				
une 4 - Vendor Certifications Evaluator 1	3	3	3	3	3	
Evaluator 2	3.00	3.00	3,00	3.00	3.00	
Average Score	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
Rounded Score Line 5 - Management Practices and Procedures		'			1	
Evaluator 1	4	4	4	4	3.5	
Evaluator 2	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	
Average Score	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	
Rounded Score	ACS 51 FINAL	ACS 52 FINAL HP S	1 FINAL SAIC		on SZ FINAL	
Section #3 - Conformance with Contract Requirements	BAFO Round	BAFO Round BAFO	O Round BAF	O Round BAFO	Round CO	IMMENTS
Line 1 - MSA Acceptance and Exceptions	2	2	2.5	2.5	2.5	<u></u>
Evaluator 1	2 2		2.5	2.5	2.5	
Evaluator 2	2		2.5	2,5	2.5	OT MEEDED FOR THE ROUND NO DIEV OR MICHAEL
Evaluator 3						OT NEEDED FOR THIS ROUND NO RISK OR INSURAN HANGES
Evaluator 4	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	
Average Score	2.00		2.50	2.50	2.50	
Rounded Score Line 2 - Benchmarking Acceptance and Exceptions			1	· -1	1	
Evaluator 1	2.5		2.5	2.5	2.5	
Evaluator 2	2.5		2.5	2.5	2.5	
Evaluator 3	2.5	2,3		5.5;	N	OT NEEDED FOR THIS ROUND NO RISK OR INSURAN
Evaluator 4				tankin and indicate and alternative and		HANGES
Average Score	2.50		2.50	2.50	2.50	
Rounded Score	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	
Line 3 - Fees Exceptions	2.5	5 2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 2	2.5	5 2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	
Evaluator 3	2.5	5 2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	NOT NEEDED FOR THIS ROUND NO RISK OR INSURA
						IOT NEEDED FOR THIS ROUND NO RISK OR INSURA CHANGES
Evaluator 4	2.50	0 2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	# 11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Average Score Rounded Score	2.50		2.50	2.50	2.50	
Line 4 - Fee Reduction Exceptions			· ·			
Evaluator 1		2 2	2.5	2.5	2.5	
Evaluator 2		2 2 2	2.5 2.5	2.5 2.5	2.5 2.5	
		4	2.3	4.3		NOT NEEDED FOR THIS ROUND NO RISK OR INSURA
Evaluator 3						CHANGES
Evaluator 3					2.50	
Evaluator 3  Evaluator 4 Average Score	2.0		2.50	2.50		
Evaluator 3  Evaluator 4  Average Score Rounded Score	2.0		2.50 2.50	2.50	2.50	
Evaluator 3  Evaluator 4  Average Score  Rounded Score  Une 5 - Compliance with negotiation rules and procedures	2.0	2.00	2.50	2.50		
Evaluator 3  Evaluator 4  Average Score Rounded Score	2.0			2.50 3 3	2.50	
Evaluator 3  Evaluator 4  Average Score  Rounded Score  Une 5 - Compliance with negotiation rules and procedures  Evaluator 1	2.0	3 3	2.50	2.50	2.50 3 3 3	
Evaluator 3  Evaluator 4  Average Score  Rounded Score  Une 5 - Compliance with negotiation rules and procedures  Evaluator 1  Evaluator 2	2.0	3 3 3 3	2.50	2.50 3 3	2.50 3 3 3	NOT NEEDED FOR THIS ROUND NO RISK OR INSURA CHANGES

tion #4 - Relationship Management Svcs and Vendor Staffing e 1 - Relationship Mgmt Svcs Requirements acceptance	ACS ST FINAL ACS SZ	FINAL HP S1 FI	NAL SAICS1		
A LANGE ALE ALE ALE CONTROL PROPERTY ACCOUNTS	BAFO Round BAFO F	Round BAFO R	ound BAFORo	und BAFO Ro	ound COMMENTS
					NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
uator 5			3	4	2.5
luator 1	3	3	3	4	2.5
luator 6	3	3	3	41	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
luator 7					NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
aluator 8					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
aluator 9					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
aluator 10					REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WITH TH
HOACO: 10					
-14 22	3	3	3	3.5	2.5 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE
aluator 23	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.83	2.50
erage Score	3.00	3,00	3.00	4.00	2.50
unded Score	and the second s	ositivis Nivelija oritoli			
ie 2 - Or Bantzation Chart and Key Notes		4			NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
aluator 5	3.5	3.5	3.5	5	3.5
aluator 1	3.5	3.5	3.5	4	3.5
aluator 6	3,3	3.3	3.5		DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
aluator 7					NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
aluator 8					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
aluator 9					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
					REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WITH T
aluator 10				1	
	3	3	3	4	3.5 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE
aluator 23	3.33	3.33	3.33	4.33	3.50
verage Score	3.50	3.50	3.50	4.50	3.50
ounded Score		3,30	234925 FDA 4 - 4 - 5 - 5	nel valifilia kalenda	
ne 3 - Governance Process		<u>international distribution</u>	u videli ili ili ili ili ili ili ili ili ili	u o noga na i an i dheisid dhialaid.	NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
valuator S		3	3.5	4	3
valuator 1	3	3	3.5	4	3
valuator 6	3	3	5.5	7	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 7					NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
valuator 8					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 9					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 10					REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WITH
	3	3	3.5	3.5	3 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE
valuator 23	3.00	3.00	3,50	3.83	3.00
verage Score	3.00	3.00	3.50	4.00	3.00
lounded Score	and the second s	3.001		van efficie (Aberel) si	angga na salah dari dari dari dari dari dari dari dari
ine 4 - Biographies	<u> </u>				NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
valuator 5				2.5	
valuator 1	3	3	3	3.5	3
valuator 6	3	3	3	3.5	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 7					NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
valuator 8					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 9					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 10					REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WITH
	3	3	3	3	3 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE
Evaluator 23	300	3.00	3.00	3.33	3.00
Average Score	3.00		3.00	3.50	3.00
Pounded Score	3.00	3.00	3.001	3.30	energia i di di Partini di Partin
Line 5 - Professional Development				The Call St. Co. St.	NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
Evaluator 5					NO LONGER ENTITED ED CI COOKTI
Evaluator 1	2.5	2.5	3	3	4
	2.5	2.5	3	3	4
Evaluator 6					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 7					NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
Evaluator 8					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 9					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 10					REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WITH
		2	3	3	4 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE
Evaluator 23	3	3 67	3.00	3.00	4.00
Average Score	2.67	2.67	3.00	3.00	4.00
Rounded Score	2.50	2.50	3.00	3.00  	4.00
Line 6 - Annual turnover rates		10 C 10 C			
					NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY
	2.5	2.5	3.5	3	2.5
Evaluator 5	2.5	2.5	3.5	3	2.5
Evaluator 1					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICT
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6					NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6 Evaluator 7					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICT
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICT
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6 Evaluator 7					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDOLING CONFOCI
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8					
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8 Evaluator 9					REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WIT
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8 Evaluator 9 Evaluator 10	2.5	2.5	3.5	3	REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WIT 2.5 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8 Evaluator 9 Evaluator 10 Evaluator 23	2.5 2.50	2.50	3.50	3.00	REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WIT 2.5 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE 2.50
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8 Evaluator 9 Evaluator 10 Evaluator 23 Average Score					REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WIT 2.5 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8 Evaluator 9 Evaluator 10 Evaluator 10 Evaluator 23 Average Score Rounded Score	2.50	2.50	3.50	3.00	REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WIT 2.5 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE 2.50 2.50
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8 Evaluator 9 Evaluator 10 Evaluator 10 Evaluator 23 Average Score Rounded Score Une 7 - Compensation	2.50	2.50	3.50	3.00	REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WIT 2.5 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE 2.50
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8 Evaluator 9 Evaluator 10 Evaluator 23 Average Score Rounded Score Line 7 - Compensation Evaluator 5	2.50	2.50 2.50	3.50 3.50	3.00 3.00	REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WIT 2.5 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE 2.50 2.50
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8 Evaluator 9 Evaluator 10 Evaluator 10 Evaluator 23 Average Score Rounded Score Une 7 - Compensation Evaluator 5 Evaluator 5 Evaluator 5	2.50	2.50 2.50 3.5	3.50 3.50	3.00	REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WIT 2.5 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE 2.50 2.50 NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8 Evaluator 9 Evaluator 10 Evaluator 23 Average Score Rounded Score Une 7 - Compensation Evaluator 5 Evaluator 1 Evaluator 5	2.50	2.50 2.50	3.50 3.50	3.00 3.00	REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WIT  2.5 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE  2.50  2.50  NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY  2  2
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8 Evaluator 9 Evaluator 10 Evaluator 10 Evaluator 23 Average Score Rounded Score Une 7 - Compensation Evaluator 5 Evaluator 5 Evaluator 5	2.50	2.50 2.50 3.5	3.50 3.50	3.00	REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WIT 2.5 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE 2.50 2.50  NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY 2 2 2 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLIC
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8 Evaluator 9 Evaluator 10 Evaluator 23 Average Score Rounded Score Une 7 - Compensation Evaluator 5 Evaluator 1 Evaluator 5	2.50	2.50 2.50 3.5	3.50 3.50	3.00	REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WIT 2.5 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE 2.50 2.50 NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY 2 2 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTION OF LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8 Evaluator 9 Evaluator 10 Evaluator 23 Average Score Rounded Score Une 7 - Compensation Evaluator 5 Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6 Evaluator 7	2.50	2.50 2.50 3.5	3.50 3.50	3.00	REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WIT 2.5 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE 2.50  NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY 2 2 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLIC NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLIC
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8 Evaluator 9 Evaluator 10  Evaluator 23 Average Score Rounded Score Une 7 - Compensation Evaluator 5 Evaluator 1 Evaluator 1 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8	2.50	2.50 2.50 3.5	3.50 3.50	3.00	REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WIT  2.5 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE  2.50  NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY  2  2  2  DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLIC NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY  DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLIC DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLIC
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8 Evaluator 9 Evaluator 10  Evaluator 23 Average Score Rounded Score Line 7 - Compensation Evaluator 1 Evaluator 1 Evaluator 5 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 6 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8 Evaluator 9	2.50	2.50 2.50 3.5	3.50 3.50	3.00	REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WIT  2.5 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE  2.50  2.50  NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY  2  2  DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLIC NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLIC DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLIC REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WI
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8 Evaluator 9 Evaluator 10  Evaluator 23 Average Score Rounded Score Une 7 - Compensation Evaluator 5 Evaluator 1 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8 Evaluator 9 Evaluator 10	2.50	2.50 2.50 3.5	3.50 3.50	3.00	REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WIT  2.5 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE  2.50  NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY  2  2  2  DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLIC NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY  DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLIC DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLIC
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8 Evaluator 9 Evaluator 10  Evaluator 23 Average Score Rounded Score Une 7 - Compensation Evaluator 1 Evaluator 1 Evaluator 5 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 6 Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8 Evaluator 9	2.50 2.50 3.5 3.5	2.50 2.50 3.5 3.5	3.50 3.50 3.3	3.00	REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WIT  2.5 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE  2.50  2.50  NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY  2  2  DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLIC NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLIC DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLIC REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WI

	ACS S1 FINAL ACS BAFO Round BAFO	O Round RAFO	FINAL SAICS1 Round BAFOR		
ion #5 - IT Service Management & Life Cycle Services 1 - IT Service Management & Life Cycle Solution	BAFO ROUNG BAFO	O Rouna DATO			
1 - IT Service Management & Life Cycle Solution					NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY
uator 1	3.5	3.5	2.5	4	4
uator 6	3.5	3.5	2.5	4	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
uator 7					NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
uator 8					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
uator 9					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
uator 10					REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WITH THE
	3	3	2.5	3.5	4 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE
uator 23	3.33	3.33	2.50	3.83	4.00
age Score	3.50	3.50	2.50	4.00	4.00
nded Score	rroman in de la companya de la Carlo Ves		sadaaningosa		
2 - IT Service Management & Life Cycle Services Questions		3. 10. KALO 1. KAMPON 1964 1928			NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY
uator 5	3	3	3.5	3	3
uator 1	3	3	3.5	3	3
uator 6					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
uator 7					NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
uator 8					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
uator 9					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
uator 10					REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WITH THE
	اد	3	3.5	3	3 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE
luator 23	3.00	3.00	3.50	3.00	3.00
rage Score	3.00	3.00	3.50	3.00	3.00
inded Score	3.00	3.00 <sub>1</sub> 2021/03/03/03/03/03		anga sa Nasawa	
3 - IT Service Management & Life Cycle Service Requirements Acceptance				res contrata Relativa nella 11.5 delle 11.5 delle 1	NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY
luator 5		3	3	2.5	3
luator 1	3	3	3	2.5	3
luator 6	3	31			DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
luator 7					NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
Juator 8					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
luator 9					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
luator 10	//				REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WITH THE
		-	اد	2.5	3 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE
luator 23	3	3	3.00	2.50	3.00
erage Score	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.50	3.00
unded Score	3.00	3.00	3.00	2,30	
te 4 - IT Service Management & Life Cycle Service Environment Accept ance		100000			NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY
aluator 5					
aluator 1	3	3	3	3	3
aluator 6	3	3	3	3	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
aluator 7					NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
aluator 8	· i				DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
aluator 9					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
aluator 10					REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WITH TH
aldato, to				_	3 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE
valuator 23	3	3	3	3	
verage Score	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
ded Cases	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00   Parana na Aparton Davido Anglianto (no mangana na pagalina mangana na mangana na mangana na mangana na mangana
ounded score ine 5 - IT Service Management & Life Cycle Service Level Re quire:nents Accep	ptance				NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY
valuator 5					NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COOK!!
valuator 1	2.5	2.5	3	3	
valuator 6	2.5	2,5	3	3	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 7					NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
valuator 8					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 9					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 10					REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WITH TH
					2 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE
valuator 23	2.5	2.5	3	3 2 00	
verage Score	2.50	2.50	3.00	3.00	2.00
Rounded Score	2.50	2.50	3.00	3.00	2.00
ine 6 - Technology Refresh Plan and Schedule				100	SOME SEA OF THE SEA OF
valuator 5					NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY
valuator 1	3		3	3	5
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 6	3	3	3	3	3
					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 7					NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
Evaluator 8					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 9					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 10				1	REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WITH T
F. d. 44-23	3	3	3	3	3 COUNTY-HAS EXPERTISE
Evaluator 23	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Average Score	3.00		3,00	3.00	3.00
Rounded Score		in the state of			
Line 7 - IT Service Management & Life Cycle Took		200 CONTRACTOR OF CONTRACT LAND	The second secon	10.100.000.000.000.000	NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY
Evaluator 5	2.5	2.5	3.5	4	3
Evaluator 1	2.5		3.5	4	3
		2.5			DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 6					NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
Evaluator 7					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8					
Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8 Evaluator 9					
Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8 Evaluator 9 Evaluator 10		7.5			DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS REPLACED EMPLOYEE WHO IS NO LONGER WITH
Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8 Evaluator 9	2.5		3.67	4.00	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS

ion #6 - Data Center Services	ACS 51 FINAL ACS 52 FINA BAFO Round BAFO Round		L Verizon S2 FINAL BAFO Round COMMENTS
1 - Data Center Solutions			DROPPED OUT DUE TO TIME CONSTRAINTS - MOVED ON TO
luator 11			OTHER PROJECTS
uator 12	4' "	3	3
luator 13	4	3	3.5 MOVED TO VOICE AND DATA SECTIONS
uator 14			
uator 15	3	4	3
uator 16	3.5	3.5	4 ADDED DUE TO EXPEDITE
uator 23	3	4	3 ADDED DUE TO EXPERTISE
rage Score	3.50	3.50	3.30
nded Score	3.50	3.50	3.50
2 - Email Solution			DROPPED OUT DUE TO TIME CONSTRAINTS - MOVED ON T
uator 11			OTHER PROJECTS
uator 12	3	3	3
uator 13	3	3	MOVED TO VOICE AND DATA SECTIONS
uator 14			
uator 15	2.5	3	3.5
uator 16	3	3	
uator 23	2.5	4	
age Score	2.80	3.20	3.10
nded Score	3.00	3.00	3.00
3 - Data Center Services Questions			DROPPED OUT DUE TO TIME CONSTRAINTS - MOVED ON
luator 11			OTHER PROJECTS
luator 12	3.5	3.5	3
luator 13	3.5	2.5	3 N
luator 14			MOVED TO VOICE AND DATA SECTIONS
Juator 15	2 *	4	3
fluator 16	3.5	3	4
luator 23	2.5	4	ADDED DUE TO EXPERTISE
erage Score	3.00	3.30	3.20
mded Score	3.00	3.50	3.00
e 4 - Data Center Service Requirements Acceptance	Lewis Louis Links (1974)	a di la conserva de la compansión de la co	
			DROPPED OUT DUE TO TIME CONSTRAINTS - MOVED ON OTHER PROJECTS
aluator 11	3.5	3	3.5
aluator 12	3.5	3	3.5
aluator 13	5.5		MOVED TO VOICE AND DATA SECTIONS
aluator 14	3	4	3
aluator 15	3.5	4	3.5
aluator 16 aluator 23	3	3	3 ADDED DUE TO EXPERTISE
	3.30	3.40	3.30
verage Score	3.50	3.50	3,50
ounded Score ne 5 - Data Center Service Environment Requirements			DROPPED OUT DUE TO TIME CONSTRAINTS - MOVED ON
			OTHER PROJECTS
valuator 11	3.5	3	3
valuator 12	3.5	3	3
valuator 13	3.3	3	MOVED TO VOICE AND DATA SECTIONS
raluator 14		3	3
valuator 15	3	31	3
valuator 16	3	3	3 ADDED DUE TO EXPERTISE
valuator 23	160000000000000000000000000000000000000	3.00	3,00
verage Score	3.20	3.00	3.00
ounded Score ne 6 - Data Center Service Lével Requirements	3.00	3.00	
			DROPPED OUT DUE TO TIME CONSTRAINTS - MOVED OF OTHER PROJECTS
valuator 12	3.5	3	3
valuator 12	3.5	3	3)
			MOVED TO VOICE AND DATA SECTIONS
valuator 14	3	3	3 4.1
valuator 15 valuator 16	3	3	3
	3	3	ADDED DUE TO EXPERTISE
valuator 23	3.20	3.00	3.00
verage Score	3.00	3.00	3.00
lounded Score Ine 7 - IT Service Continuity and DR Program			
			DROPPED OUT DUE TO TIME CONSTRAINTS - MOVED O OTHER PROJECTS
valuator 11	3.5	3	3.5
valuator 12	3.5	3	3 %
valuator 13			MOVED TO VOICE AND DATA SECTIONS
valuator 14	3	4	3
valuator 15	3.5	4	3
valuator 16	3.5	3	3 ADDED DUE TO EXPERTISE
valuator 23			
verage Score	3.40	3,40	3.10
lounded Score	3.50	3.50	3.00
ine 8 - Data Center Tools	77,4455		DROPPED OUT DUE TO TIME CONSTRAINTS - MOVED O
valuator 11			OTHER PROJECTS
	3	2.5	3.5
valuator 12 valuator 13	3.5	2.5	3.54
	3.3		MOVED TO VOICE AND DATA SECTIONS
valuator 14	3	4	
valuator 15 Evaluator 16	3,5	3	3 3
Evaluator 23	3	4	2.5 ADDED DUE TO EXPERTISE
Average Score	3.20	3.20	3.10

	ACS S1 FINAL ACS SZ FINAL	HP S1 FINAL SAIC S1		
ection #7 - Service Desk Services	BAFO Round BAFO Round		ound BAFO Round	COMMENTS
tion #7 - Service Desk Solutions	EDNO AND			
	3	3.5	3,5	
raluator 17	3	3	3.5	* *
raluator 18				NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
valuator 19	3	4.5	3	
valuator 20				EXTERNAL EVALUATOR - DROPPED OUT DUE TO TIME CONSTRAINTS
valuator 21	2.83	3.67	3.33	
verage Score	3.00	3.50	3.50	
ounded Score		3.30		
ne 2 - Service Desk Services Questions		3	3.5	
valuator 17		3.5	3.5	
valuator 18	3	3,2	9.0	NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
valuator 19		3.5	3 8	
valuator 20	3	3.3		EXTERNAL EVALUATOR - DROPPED OUT DUE TO TIME
				CONSTRAINTS
valuator 21			3.22	CORDINARIA
verage Score	3.00	3.33	3.33	
dounded Score	3.00	3.50	3.50	
ine 3 - Service Desk Service Requirements Acceptance				
valuator 17	3	3 3	3	
valuator 18	3	3	3 ,	
valuator 19				NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
valuator 20	3	3	3	
			1, 14	EXTERNAL EVALUATOR - DROPPED OUT DUE TO TIME CONSTRAINTS
Evaluator 21	3.00	3.00	3.00	
Average Score		3.00	3.00	
Rounded Score	3.00	3.00	3.00	And the state of t
Line 4 - Service Desk Service Environment Acceptance	The second secon	3	2 COMPANIES AND ADDRESS	
Evaluator 17		3		
Evaluator 18	3	3	3	NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
Evaluator 19		3		NO EDITOCK EVIL COTED D. GOOT.
Evaluator 20	35	3	3	EXTERNAL EVALUATOR - DROPPED OUT DUE TO TIME
			1.0	CONSTRAINTS
Evaluator 21			3.33	CONSTRAINTS
Average Score	3.00	3.00	3.00	
Rounded Score	3.00	3.00	3.00	the same of the sa
Line 5 - Service Desk Service Level Requirements Acceptance			No. of the last of	
Evaluator 17	2.5	3	2.5	
Evaluator 18	2.5	3	2.5	
Evaluator 19		*		NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
Evaluator 20	2.5	3	2	
Cyandator 20				EXTERNAL EVALUATOR - DROPPED OUT DUE TO TIME
Evaluator 21				CONSTRAINTS
Average Score	2.50	3.00	2.33	
Payed of Scare	2.50	3.00	2.50	
Line 6 - Service Desk Tools	. Pagera jarok vieng sa pilabangsan			
Evaluator 17	3	3.5	3.5	
	3 86549 28	3	3.5	
Evaluator 18		*	, 17°	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 19	3	4	4 6	i i
Evaluator 20				EXTERNAL EVALUATOR - DROPPED OUT DUE TO TIME
		**************************************		CONSTRAINTS
Evaluator 21	3.00	3.50	3.67	***************************************
Average Score		3.50	3.50	
Rounded Score	3.00	3.30	3.30]	

	ACS ST FINAL	ACS SZ FINAL	HP 51 FINAL	SAIC SI FINA BAFO Round		COMMENTS
ion #8 - Desktop Support Services	BAFO Round	BAFQ Round	DATO KOUNG	DALC KONU	, DAI O ROUM	agas (gas) (Tagas agas subsessor subsers) (sada no bus of subsersion of the first of the subsersion of
1 - Desktop Support Solutions			3.5	}	3	
uator 17 ,			3		3	
uator 18				1		DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
uator 19	3.5		3.5		3	
luator 20						DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
luator 21	3.1	7	3.33		3.00	
rage Score	3.0		3.50		3.00	
inded Score	( 3.0	-1	1		·	
e 2 - Desktop Support Services Questions	3.	5	3.	5	3	
luator 17		3	3.	5	3	
luator 18						DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
fuator 19	3.	.5	3.	5	3	TO THE PART OF THE
Juator 20						DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
luator 21	3.3	13	3.5	0	3.00	
erage Score unded Score	3.5	50	3.5	0	3.00	
e 3 - Desktop Support Service Requirements Acceptance			****		experience de la constantina della constantina d	W.
sluator 17		3		3	3	
aluator 18		3		3	3	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
aluator 19						DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDOLING CONFLICTS
sluator 20		3		3	3	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
aluator 21					3.00	DROFFED OUT DUE TO SCREDULING COMPLICES
erage Score	3.0		3,0		3.00	
unded Score	3.	00	3.0	ю	3.00	I
e 4 - Desktop Support Service Environment Acceptance	,	NAMES AND POST OF THE PARTY AND THE PARTY AN	Interior	-1	2 1	
aluator 17		3		3	3	
aluator 18		3		3	3	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
aluator 19					3	DIOLI-ED OUT DOE TO SCREDOLING CONTROLS
aluator 20		3		3	3	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
aluator 21				00	3.00	DROFFED GOT DOC TO SCHEDOLING COM BOTS
verage Score		.00		00	3.00	
ounded Scare	3.	.00	3.	00	3.00	<b>!</b>
ne 5 - Desktop Support Service Level Requirements		security management of the last	ment.	-1		
valuator 17		3		3	3	
valuator 18		3		3	3	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 19						DROFFED OUT DOE TO SCHEDOLING GOTALEGO
valuator 20		3		3	3	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 21					2.00	DROPPED OUT BOX TO SCIEDOLING CONT. DOL
verage Score		.00		.00	3.00	
ounded Score	3	1.00	3	.00	3.00	
ne 6 - Desktop Support Tools	1	press/2500077007000	descriptori.		3.5	
valuator 17		3.5		3.5	3.5	
valuator 18		3		3	3	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 19						DKOTTED GOT BOE 10 SEREE SERVE SERVE
valuator 20		4		4	3	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 21					3,17	SHOTTED GOT EGE TELEFICIAL
Average Score		3.50		.50	3.00	
Rounded Score		3.50	AL HP S1 FINA			ALPRODUCTION OF THE PROPERTY O
	ACSSERIN	AL AUSSEFIN	nd BAFO Roun	A BATODA		COMMENTS
Section #9 - Application Development & Maintenance Services	BAFO ROU	na BAFU KOU	na BAFO KOUN	a baruso	una paronoma	A constant of the constant of
Line 1 - Application Development & Maintenance Services		2.00		3.5	4	N M
Evaluator 18		2.5		4	4	
Evaluator 16		3		3	3	
valuator 22		2.83		3.50	3.67	
Average Score		3.00		3.50	3.50	
Rounded Score	1	3.301	1	1	1	•
ine 2 - Application Development & Maintenance Services Questions	I	2.5	INTERNATION OF THE PROPERTY OF	3	3	
Evaluator 18		3		3.5	3	
Evaluator 16		3		3.5	3.5	
Evaluator 22		2.83	Discourage Control	3.33	3.17	
Average Score		3.00		3.50	3.00	
Rounded Score		001	i	. ,	+	•
Line 3 - Application Development and Maintenance Services Requirements Acceptance	. 1	3		3	3	
Evaluator 18	<del></del>	3		3,5	3	
Evaluator 16		3	46	3.5	3	
Evaluator 22		3.00	ONE OF STREET	3.33	3.00	
Average Score		3.00		3.50	3.00	
Raunded Score Line 4 - Application Development and Maintenance Service Environment Acceptance	1	**1	1	'		
		3		3	3	**************************************
Evaluator 18		3		3.5	3	
Evaluator 16		3		3.5	3	
Evaluator 22		3.00	- Company	3.33	3.00	
Average Score		3.00	1	3.50	3.00	
Rounded Score Line 5 - Application Development and Maintenance Service Level Requirements Accer	ptance	1	,	1	'	,
	1	2.5		2	2.5	
Evaluator 18		3	-	3	3	
Evaluator 16 Evaluator 22		3		3	3	
		2.83		2.67	2.83	
	1	3.00		2.50	3.00	
Average Score						\$ contract to the second secon
Average Score Rounded Score		3.00				
Average Score Rounded Score Line 6 - Application Development and Maintenance Tools				3.5	3	47.34.4
Average Score Rounded Score Line 6 - Application Development and Maintenance Tools Evaluator 18		2.5		3.5	3 3	
Average Score Rounded Score Line 6 - Application Development and Maintenance Tools Evaluator 18 Evaluator 16		2.5		3	3 3	
Average Score Rounded Score Line 6 - Application Development and Maintenance Tools Evaluator 18		2.5			3 3 3 3.00	0.00

48	ACS S1 FINAL ACS S2 FINAL HP S BAFO Round BAFO Round BAFO			OMMENTS
tion #10 - Data Network Services e 1 - Data Network Solution	DAPO ROUNG DATO ROUNG DAIG			
aluator 12	3		3.5	-
aluator 23	3		3	
aluator 13		Marine		DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
aluator 24			3.5	
aluator 25	3.5		3	
aluator 26	4		4	
aluator 27	3		3	
aluator 28				DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
aluator 29	3	4. #r	3	
aluator 14	3.5	X X	3.5	
aluator 20	3.44		3.39	
verage Score	3.50		3.50	
ounded Score	the resolution of the earth of the e			
ne 2 - Data Network Services Questions	3	· Control of the cont	4	
valuator 12	3		3	
valuator 23	. 4		3	
valuator 13		344 T		DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 24	4	1.71	3.5	
valuator 25	3.5		3	
valuator 26	4		. 3	
valuator 27	3	7.7	3	
valuator 28				DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 29	2.5	10 to	3.5	
valuator 14 valuator 20	2.5	***	4	
	3.28		3.33	
verage Score	3.50		3.50	
ounded Score Ine 3- Data Network Service Requirements Acceptance	razandaten eta argaletak eta 1997ak			
valuator 12	3	order and ordered	3	
	2.5	40	3	
valuator 23	3.5	Yes	3	
valuator 13 valuator 24				DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
	3		3	
valuator 25	3		3	
valuator 26	3	200 September 1890	3	
valuator 27	2.5 0.	1 A. M. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		
valuator 28		* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *		DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 29 valuator 14	3	11 57 1		
valuator 20	3	1 1 1		.,
Verage Score	2.94		3.00	)
Rounded Score	3.00		3.00	
line 4 - Data Network Service Environment Requirem ents				grand price and the control of the c
valuator 12	3	T		
Evaluator 23	3			3
Evaluator 13	3		* /	3
Evaluator 24			3.5	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 25	3		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Evaluator 26	3	e militi		3
Evaluator 27	3	yjk.		3
Evaluator 28	3	9.		3
Evaluator 29				DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 14	3	A CAPPART OF A		3
Evaluator 20	3			3
Average Score	3.00		3.0	
Rounded Store	3.00		3.0	
Line 5 - Data Network Service Level Requirements				Allega pagatawa ji dan walio ata Hari
Evaluator 12				3
Evaluator 23	. 3	Section 18 to 18		3
Evaluator 13	3.5	1		3
Evaluator 24	. 100	N 1994		DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 25	3	1982	350 S 70 S 35	3
Evaluator 26	3.5			3
Evaluator 27	. 3	A. A. 1784		3
Evaluator 28	3 4	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		3
Evaluator 29		and the State of t		DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 14	3	W 15	· · · · ·	3
Evaluator 20	1 4 3 Y			3
Average Score	3.11		3.0	
Rounded Scare	3.00		3.4	
Line 6 - Data Network Tools				바람 보통하게 되는 이 전기를 하는데 모든 모든
Evaluator 12	2.5			3.5
Evaluator 23	3	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		3.5
Evaluator 13	4	g ywr y w	" <u>1</u>	3
Evaluator 24		4.4	* , * * , *	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 25	4			3.5
Evaluator 26	3	e de la companya della companya della companya de la companya della companya dell		3
Evaluator 27	3	2.77		3
Evaluator 28	3	1 × 4 × 1 × 31		3
				DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
1FValuator 29	A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR	The state of the s	M444	2.5
Evaluator 29 Evaluator 14	3		76.00 A 63.00 C	2.3
Evaluator 14	3			3.5

	ACS S1 FINAL ACS S2 FINAL HP S1 FINAL	SAIC S1 FINAL Verizon S2 FINAL BAFO Round BAFO Round COI	MMENTS
tion #11 - Voice Communications Services	BAFO Round BAFO Round BAFO Round	DAFO ROUND DATE OF THE PARTY OF	Sillatelin del tanciani en
1 - Voice Communications Solution	2.5	3.5	
luator 12	2	4	
luator 23	3.5	2.5	OPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
luator 13 luator 24		3	OTTED OCT TO THE TOTAL
luator 25	3.5	2.5	
lluator 26	3.5	3.5	
iluator 27	3	3	
aluator 28			ROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
sluator 29	3.5	2.5	
aluator 14	2.5	3.17	
aluator 20 erage Score	3.06	3.17	
unded Score	3.00	evil, enumerous productions	
ne 2 - Voice Communications Services Questions		3	
aluator 12	3	3	
aluator 23	3.5	3	CONCLUTE
aluator 13			ROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
aluator 24	3	3	
valuator 25	3	3	
valuator 26	3.5	3 3	
valuator 28	3	3	PROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 29		3	
valuator 14	2.5	3.5	
valuator 20	3.06	3.06	
verage Score	3.00	3.00	
ounded Score			
Ine 3 - Voice Communications Service Requirements Acceptance	3	3	
valuator 12	3	3	
valuator 23	3	3	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 13 valuator 24		3	DROPPED ON I DOE TO SCHEDULING COM ENTE
valuator 25	3	3	
valuator 26	3	3	
valuator 27		3	
valuator 28	3	1.0	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 29	3	3	
valuator 14		3	
Evaluator 20	3.00	3.00	
Average Score	3.00	3.00	
Rounded Score Line 4 - Voice Communications Service Environment Requirements		1975	
Evaluator 12	3	3	
Evaluator 12 Evaluator 23	3	3	
Evaluator 13	3		DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 24		3	
Evaluator 25	3	3	
Evaluator 26		3.5	
Evaluator 27	3	3	
Evaluator 28	****		DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 29	3	400	
Evaluator 14	3	300	
Evaluator 20 Average Score	3.00	3.06	
- 160	3.00	3.00	
Line 5 - Voice Communications Service Level Requirements	-		3
Evaluator 12	3		3
Evaluator 23			3
Evaluator 13	3	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 24	3		3
Evaluator 25	3		3
Evaluator 26	2.0		3
Evaluator 27	3		3 CONTROL OUT THE TO SCHEDILLING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 28		****	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 29	3		3
Evaluator 14 Evaluator 20	3	3.0	3
Average Score	3.00	3.0	
Rounded Score	3.00		
Rounded Score Line 6 - Voice Communications Tools		TO SECURE	3
Evaluator 12	3 3	1 m	3
Evaluator 23	3 3 40	10 PM	3
Evaluator 13	3	* ·* · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 24	3.5	Part S	2
Evaluator 25			3
Evaluator 26	3 3		2
Evaluator 27	3		3
Evaluator 28			DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 29	3		3
Evaluator 14	3	14. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )	3
Evaluator 20	3.06		.78
Average Score			.00

		THE PARTY OF THE P	CALCES FINAL	Verizon 52 FINAL	The state of the s
		S2 FINAL, HP S1 FINAL D Round BAFO Round	SAIC S1 FINAL BAFO Round		COMMENTS
tion #12 - Converged Network Management Services	DATO ROUND PAIC	a de la companya de la constanta de la constan			
1 - Converged Network Management Solution		2.5	THE RESERVE OF THE PROPERTY.	3.5	
uator 12	'	2.5		4.5	
uator 23		3.5		2.5	
uator 13		5.5	10 May 1		DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
uator 24		3.5	and the same	3	
uator 25			30°	2.5	
uator 26		3.5		3.5	
uator 27	*	3.5 4	189		
uator 28		3	10 Mg 70	3	
uator 29					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
uator 14		3.5	N. A. B. B.	2.5	
uator 20		3.5		2.5	<u> </u>
		3.22		3.06	
rage Score		3.00		3.00	
nded Score 2 - Converged Network Management Questions		The San Age and Albert	ellekkanoe (kali		
		3	Marie Marie Marie	3.!	5
uator 12		2.5	, Property		3
uator 23		3.5			3
uator 13		3.5			DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
uator 24		4			3
uator 25		·····	7.00		3
uator 26		3.5	7 (*)		3
uator 27		3.5	V to	SSSSS	3
uator 28		3	м .		DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
uator 29			64		
uator 14		4	100		3
uator 20		3		COUNTRY CO.	3
rage Score		3.33		3.0	
anded Score		3.50		3.0	) (P) (P) (P) (P) (P) (P) (P) (P) (P) (P
3 - Converged Network Management Service Requirements Acceptance	A THE ANGEOGRAPHICA	and A. S.			agramma and the control of the contr
	***************************************	3			5
luator 12		3		4	3
luator 23		3 %	94 192		3
luator 13			359 (6.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1		DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
luator 24		3	le i	1.66	3
luator 25		34			3
aluator 26		3	e de la companya de		3
aluator 27		3	1. A. M. G. C.		3
aluator 28	v v v v	3			DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
aluator 29	<i>9</i>				3
aluator 14		3*		NA	3
aluator 20		3			
verage Score		3.00		3.	
nunded Store		3.00		3.	00
ne 4 - Converged Network Management Service Environment Acceptance		Separation (Separation)			
valuator 12		3		( )	3
valuator 23		3 , , , , ,	W	M	3
raluator 13	4	3	the second	i a	3
raluator 24			ALC: NO SERVICE		DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
		3			3
aluator 25		3 6			3
aluator 26		3			3
raluator 27		3	Sear Allega	\	3
valuator 28					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
aluator 29		3	1725		3
raluator 14		3			3
valuator 20		- Stringer Angelein		3	.00
verage Score		3.00			.00
ounded Score		3.00	756907 D. G. SCUSER (\$170)	er i Jane State d'Elmer	
ne 5 - Converged Network Management Service Level Requirements		NAME OF THE OWNER, WHEN			36
valuator 12		3 ,			2.5
valuator 23	, 1	3	W. A.		2.5
valuator 13		3	Control of the second of the	K000000	2.5
					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 24		3	124		3
valuator 24 valuator 25					
valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 26					3
valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 26 valuator 27					3 2.5
valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 26 valuator 27 valuator 28					3 2.5 3
valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 26 valuator 27 valuator 28 valuator 29		3 3 3 3			3 2.5 3 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 26 valuator 27 valuator 28 valuator 29		3 3 3 3			3 2.5 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 2.5
valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 26 valuator 27 valuator 28 valuator 29 valuator 29 valuator 14		3 3 3 3			3 2.5 3 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 2.5 3
valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 26 valuator 27 valuator 28 valuator 29 valuator 14 valuator 20		3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3			3 2.5 3 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 2.5 3 2.72
valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 26 valuator 27 valuator 28 valuator 29 valuator 14 valuator 20 liverage Score		3 3 3 3			3 2.5 3 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 2.5 3 2.72 3.00
valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 26 valuator 27 valuator 28 valuator 29 valuator 14 valuator 20 valuator 20 valuator 20 valuator 40 valuator 20 valuator 20 valuator 20 valuator 20 valuator 20		3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3			3 2.5 3 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 2.5 3 2.72 3.00
valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 26 valuator 27 valuator 28 valuator 29 valuator 29 valuator 20 valuator 20 valuator 20 verage Score tounded Score Ine 6 - Converged Network Management Tools		3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3			3 2.5 3 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 2.5 3 2.72 3.00
valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 26 valuator 27 valuator 28 valuator 29 valuator 14 valuator 14 valuator 20 liverage Score lounded Score line 6 - Converged Network Management Tools valuator 12		3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3			3 2.5 3 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 2.5 3 2.72 3.00
valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 25 valuator 27 valuator 27 valuator 28 valuator 29 valuator 14 valuator 20 valuator 20 valuator 20 core counded Score line 6 - Converged Network Management Tools valuator 12 valuator 12 valuator 12 valuator 12		3 3 3 3 3 3 3,00 3,00 3,00			3 2.5 3 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 2.5 3 2.72 3.00
valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 26 valuator 27 valuator 28 valuator 28 valuator 29 valuator 14 valuator 20 verage Score Sounded Score Line 6 - Converged Network Management Tools valuator 12 valuator 12 valuator 12 valuator 13 valuator 13		3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3			3 2.5 3 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 2.5 3 2.7.7 3.00 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5
valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 26 valuator 27 valuator 28 valuator 29 valuator 14 valuator 20 valuator 20 valuator 20 line 6 - Converged Network Management Tools valuator 12 valuator 12 valuator 12 valuator 23 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 13	1	3 3 3 3 3 3 3.00 3.00 3.00			3 2.5 3 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 2.5 3 2.72 3.00 3.5 3.5 3.5 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 26 valuator 27 valuator 28 valuator 29 valuator 14 valuator 20 valuator 20 valuator 20 line 6 - Converged Network Management Tools valuator 12 valuator 12 valuator 12 valuator 23 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 13	ANA PARAMETERS	3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3,00 3,00 3,00 3,5			3 2.5 3 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 2.5 3 2.72 3.00 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5
valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 26 valuator 27 valuator 28 valuator 29 valuator 14 valuator 20 valuator 50 core counded Score Counded Score Line 6 - Converged Network Management Tools Evaluator 12 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 14 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 14 Evaluator 15 Evaluator 15 Evaluator 16 Evaluator 17 Evaluator 17 Evaluator 18 Evaluator 19 Evaluator 24 Evaluator 25		3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.5			3 2.5 3 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 2.5 3 3 2.72 3.00 3.5 3.5 3.5 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 3.5 3 3 5 3 5 3 5 5 3 5 5 5 3 5 5 5 5 5
valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 26 ivaluator 27 valuator 28 valuator 29 valuator 29 valuator 14 Evaluator 20 dverage Score Rounded Score		3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3,00 3,00 3,00 3,00			3 2.5 3 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 2.5 3 2.72 3.00 3.5 3.5 3.5 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 3.5 3 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 3.5 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3
valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 26 valuator 27 valuator 28 valuator 29 valuator 14 valuator 20 Average Score Saunded Score Line 6 - Converged Network Management Tools Evaluator 12 Evaluator 12 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 23 Evaluator 24 Evaluator 24 Evaluator 25 Evaluator 26 Evaluator 26 Evaluator 27		3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.5			3 2.5
valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 26 valuator 27 valuator 28 valuator 29 valuator 14 valuator 20 Average Score Rounded Score Line 6 - Converged Network Management Tools Evaluator 13 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 24 Evaluator 25 Evaluator 26 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 28		3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3,00 3,00 3,00 3,00			3 2.5 3 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 2.5 3 2.72 3.00 3.5 3.5 3.5 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 3.5 3 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 3.5 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3
valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 26 valuator 27 valuator 28 valuator 29 valuator 29 valuator 14 valuator 20 Carlon Score Rounded Score Line 6 - Converged Network Management Tools valuator 12 valuator 12 valuator 13 valuator 23 valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 25 valuator 25 valuator 25 valuator 25 valuator 26 valuator 27 valuator 27 valuator 27 valuator 28 valuator 28 valuator 29	7.5	3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3,00 3,00 3,00 3,00			3 2.5 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 2.5 3 2.72 3.000 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5
valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 26 ivaluator 27 valuator 28 valuator 29 valuator 14 Evaluator 20 Average Score Rounded Score Line 6 - Converged Network Management Tools Evaluator 12 Evaluator 12 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 23 Evaluator 24 Evaluator 25 Evaluator 25 Evaluator 26 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 28 Evaluator 29 Evaluator 29 Evaluator 39 Evaluator 30		3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5			3 2.5 3 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 2.5 3 3.2.72 3.00 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 3.5 5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3
valuator 24 valuator 25 valuator 26 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 28 Evaluator 29 Evaluator 14 Evaluator 20 Average Score Rounded Score Line 6 - Converged Network Management Tools Evaluator 13 Evaluator 12 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 24 Evaluator 25 Evaluator 26 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 28 Evaluator 29 Evaluator 20		3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3			3 2.5 3 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 2.5 3 2.72 3.00 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5
Evaluator 24 Evaluator 25 Evaluator 26 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 28 Evaluator 29 Evaluator 14 Evaluator 20 Average Score Rounded Score Line 6 - Converged Network Management Tools Evaluator 12 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 23 Evaluator 24 Evaluator 25 Evaluator 26 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 28 Evaluator 29 Evaluator 29 Evaluator 29 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 29 Evaluator 29 Evaluator 29 Evaluator 29		3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5			3 2.5 3 3 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 2.5 3 3.2.72 3.00 DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 3.5 5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3

		1 FINAL Verizon S2 FINAL ROUND BAFO ROUND COMMENTS
on #13 - Converged Network VOIP Services	BAFO Round BAFO Round BAFO Round BAFO	Round BAPO Rounu
1 - Converged Network VOIP Solution	- Table 1	4
uator 12	3	4
pator 23		3
uator 13		DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
uator 24	3.5	4
uator 25	3.5	3
uator 26		4
uator 27		3
uator 28	****	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
uator 29	3	3
uator 14	3	4
luator 20	3.33	3.56
rage Score	3.50	3.50
inded Score	and a sub-late of the first of the second sub-late of the second sub-late of the second sub-late of the second	
2 - Converged Network VOIP Questions	3	3.5
luator 12		3.5
luator 23	3.5	3
luator 13		DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
luator 24	3.5	4
luator 25	3	3
sluator 26	3.5	3.5
eluator 27	3	3
aluator 28		DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
aluator 29		3
aluator 14		4
aluator 20	3.17	3.39
erage Score	3.00	3.50
unded Score		
ne 3 - Converged Network Management Service Requirements Acceptance	3	3
aluator 12	3	3
aluator 23	3	3
aluator 13		DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
aluator 24	3	3
valuator 25	3	3
valuator 26	3	3
valuator 27	3	3
valuator 28		DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 29	3	3
valuator 14	3	3
valuator 20	3.00	3.00
verage Score	3,00	3.00
ounded Score	era – sabataratus kirjus ir 1945 kaina <b>ir 19</b>	
ine 4 - Converged Network VOIP Service Environment Acceptance	3	3
valuator 12	3	3
valuator 23	3	3
valuator 13		DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 24	3	3
valuator 25	3	3
Evaluator 26	3	3
Evaluator 27	3	3
Evaluator 28		DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 29	3	3
Evaluator 14	3	3
Evaluator 20	3.00	3.00
Average Score	3.00	3.00
Rounded Score Line 5 - Converged Network VOIP Service Level Requirements		
	3	3
Evaluator 12	3	2.5
Evaluator 23	3	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 13		
Evaluator 24	3	3
Evaluator 25	3	2.5
Evaluator 26	3	3
Evaluator 27	3	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 28		
Evaluator 29	3	2.5
Evaluator 14	3	3
Evaluator 20	3.00	2.83
Average Score	3.00	3.00 Section of the s
Rounded Score Line 6 - Converged Network VOIP Tools		
Line 6 - Converged Network Voir Tools	<u>3</u>	3.5
Evaluator 12	3	3.5
Evaluator 23	3.5	3
Evaluator 13		DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 24	3.5	3
Evaluator 25	3	3
Evaluator 26	3	3
Evaluator 27	3	3
Evaluator 28		DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 29	3	3
	3 3	3 3 3.11

	ACS S1 FINAL ACS 52	DAEC D	und BAFO Rot	and BAFO Rou	und COMMENTS	4000
on #14 - Transition	BAFO Round BAFO F	ound BARD K	juna barono	-11u		
1 - Management Processes					NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY	
iator 5	3	3	3.5	4.5	4	
uator 1 uator 6	3.5	3.5	3.5	4.5	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS	
uator 7					NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY	
uator 8					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS	
uator 9					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS	
uator 10	3.25	3,25	3.50	4.50	4.00	
rage Score	3.00	3.00	3.50	4.50	4.00	
nded Score					NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY	
2 - Technology Transition					3.5	
luator 1	3	3	3.5	4	4	
luator 6	3	3	3.5	4	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS	
luator 7					NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY	
luator 8					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS	
luator 9					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS	
luator 10	3.00	3.00	3.50	4.00	3.75	
erage Score	3.00	3.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	
unded Score		Artes State And State	Statistics related		THE PARTY OF THE PARTY OF THE PARTY	
e 3 - Proposed Transition Schedule	Stantistics and Control				NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY	
duator 5	3	3	4	4	4	
sluator 1	3	3	4	4	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS	
aluator 6					NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY	
aluator 8					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS	
aluator 9					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS	
aluator 10		2.00	4.00	4,00	4,00	
erage Score	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	
unded Score	3,00	3.00	4,001 45 (24.05) \$20.056			
ne 4 - Policies and Procedures Development Approach			The state of the s	1931 - ALCONDO 11 HANGE SELECT	NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY	
aluator 5	3	3	3	3	3.5	
aluator 1	3	3	3	3	3.5	
raluator 6	3				DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICT	
valuator 7					NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY	
aluator 8					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICT	
valuator 9					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICT	,
valuator 10	3.00	3.00	3.00	3,00	3.50	
verage Score	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.50 p.4.44 p.4.4 (1.7.4 p. 1.1.4 p. 1.4.4	
ounded Score ine 5 - Legal and Financial Transition					NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY	
valuator 5				2	3	
valuator 1	3	3	3	3	3	
valuator 6	3	3	3	31	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICT	S
valuator 7					NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY	
valuator 8					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLIC	
valuator 9					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLIC	.'S
valuator 10	3,00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
Average Score	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
Rounded Score		President (S				
riue 9 - Aguaga and Control Moies and Weshamping					NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY	
Evaluator 5	3	3	3	4	4	
Evaluator 1	3	3	3	4	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLIC	TS
Evaluator 6					NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY	
Evaluator 7 Evaluator 8					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLIC	TS
Evaluator 9					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLIC	TS
Evaluator 10		2.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	
Average Score	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	-
Rounded Score	3.00	3.00	7,000 7,000,000,000,000,000,000			
Rounded Score Line 7 - Transition Plan Vendor Questions		2 - L 1 - L			NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY	
Evaluator S	3	3	3	4	3	
Evaluator 1	3	3	3	4	3	
Evaluator 6	3	الأسواي			DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLI	JT5
Evaluator 7	A A A A STORY OF THE STORY OF T				NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY	
Evaluator 8	- W				DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFU	
Evaluator 9					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLI	UTS_
Evaluator 10	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	
Average Score	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	
Rounded Score Line 8 - Disentanglement	May the beautiful and the second of the seco		1000		NO LONGED PARTIONERS BY COURT	
					NO LONGER EMPLOYEED BY COUNTY	
Evaluator 5 Evaluator 1	2.5	2.5	3	3	3	
Evaluator 6	2.5	2.5	3	3	DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFL	ICTS
Evaluator 7					NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY	.013
Evaluator 8					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFL	ICTS
Evaluator 9					DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFI	
Evaluator 10		3.53	3.00	3.00	3.00	
Average Score	2.50		3.00	3.00	3.00	
Rounded Score	2.50	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	

I - Data Center Recurring Fees ator 30	2.5	2.5	5 5	11
ator 31ator 32	2	2.5 2.5	5	
ator 33 ator 34		2.5	5	NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
iator 35	2			NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
age Score	2.10	2.60	5.00	
nded Score  2 - Service Desk Recurring Fees	2.00[	1	5	
uator 30	4	2	4.5	
uator 31 uator 32	4	2 2	4.5	
uator 33 uator 34			5	NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
luator 35	4	1		NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
luator 5 rage Score	4.00	1.60 1.50	4.70	
inded Score e 3 - Desktop Recurring Fees	4.00		100 section (100 feb 100 feb 1	
luator 30	4	2.5	4.5	
luator 31 luator 32	4	2	4.5	
luator 33	4			NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
sluator 34 sluator 35	4	2	5	NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
aluator S	4.00	2.20	4.60 4.50	
erage Score unded Score	4.00	2.00	4.50	success and control of the control o
e 4 - Application Development and Maintenance Recurring Fees	3	4.5	4.5	
aluator 31	3 3	4	4	
aluator 32 aluator 33	3	4.5	4.5	NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
aluator 34 raluator 35	3	4.5	5	NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
raluator 5	3.00	4.30	4.40	
verage Score ounded Score	3.00	4.50	4.50	
ne 5 - Data Network Recurring Fees		,		SCORING FOR THIS SECTION IS INCLUDED IN LINE #7
valuator 30 valuator 31				
valuator 32				NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
valuator 33 valuator 34				
valuator 35 valuator 5				NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
Average Score				
Rounded Score Line 6 - Volce Communications Recurring Fees				SCORING FOR THIS SECTION IS INCLUDED IN LINE #8
Evaluator 30	and the second s			
Evaluator 31 Evaluator 32				
Evaluator 33				NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
Evaluator 34 Evaluator 35		*		NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
Evaluator 5 Average Score				
Rounded Score	Į l			4
Line 7 - Converged Network Recurring Fees Evaluator 30		5		4
Evaluator 31 Evaluator 32		5		4.5
Evaluator 32		5		NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
Evaluator 34 Evaluator 35		5		NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
Evaluator 5		5.00		4.20
Average Score Rounded Score		5.00	ı	4.00
Line 8 - Converged VOIP Recurring Fees Evaluator 30		5		2
Evaluator 31		4.5		1
Evaluator 32 Evaluator 33		5		NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
Evaluator 34		5		NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
Evaluator 35 Evaluator 5		4.90		1.40
Average Score Raunded Score		5.00		1.50
Line 9 - Transition Fees	j 5)	5 0	4	1
Evaluator 30 Evaluator 31	4.5	5 2 5 0	4 3.5	1
Evaluator 32	4.5 4.5	5 1	3.5	1
Evaluator 33 Evaluator 34	5	5 1	4	NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY 1
Evaluator 35 Evaluator 5				NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
Average Score	4.70 5.00	5.00 0.80 5.00 1.00	3.80 4.00	1.00
Rounded Score Line 10 - Network and VOIP Transition Fees		Pro-0012402500000000000000000000000000000000		1
Evaluator 30		<u>5</u>		1
Evaluator 31 Evaluator 32		5	_	1
Evaluator 33 Evaluator 34		5		NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
Evaluator 35		5		NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
Evaluator 5 Average Score		5.00	***************************************	1.00
Rounded Score	1	5.00	1	
Une 11 - Hourly Rates Evaluator 30	4.5	5 3 5 2		1.5
Evaluator 31 Evaluator 32	4.5 4.5	4.5 3.5	3.5	1.5
Evaluator 33	4.5	5 3	3	NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY
Evaluator 34 Evaluator 35	5	5 4	4	1
Evaluator 5	4.60	4.90 3.10	3.20	NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY  1.60
Average Score Rounded Score	4.50	5.00 3.00	3.00	1.50
Section #16 - Alternate Proposals	ACS S1 FINAL ACS S BAFO Round BAFO	FINAL HP S1 FINAL Round BAFO Round		rizon S2 FINAL IFO Round COMMENTS
Line 1 - Flexibility of Service With Alternate Proposals			*******	
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 30				
Evaluator 5				NO LONGER A COUNTY EMPLOYEE
Evaluator 12 Evaluator 36		7.77		NOT SCORED THIS ROUND

ALT Due Difference	BAFO Round B	ICS 52 FINAL HP BAFO Round BA		AICS1 FINAL V AFO Round B	AFO Round C	OMMENTS
tion #17 - Due Diligence e 1 - References - Business View				3	3	
luator 1	1.5	1.5	3.00	3.00	3.00	
erage Score	1.50 1.50	1.50 1.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	
unded Score	1.30	1.50	3.00(	,	,	
e 2 - Site Visit - Business View	1	1	i.			
aluator 12						
aluator 26						
aluator 15						
aluator 37						
aluator 36						COMBINED SCORES FOR MULTIPLE COMPONENTS
erage Score	3.68	3.72	3.96	3.73	4.00	
ounded Score	3.50	3.50	4.00	3.50	4.00	
ne 3 - References - Technical View		1	3	3	3.5	
valuator 12	3	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.50	
verage Score	3.00		3.00	3.00	3.50	
ounded Score	3.00	3.001	3.00			1
ne 4 - Site Visit - Technical View	l i	i l	ì			
aluator 12		<u> </u>				
valuator 26						
valuator 15						
valuator 13						
valuator 37						COMBINED SCORES FOR MULTIPLE COMPONENTS
valuator 36 verage Score	3.93		3.89			
ounded Score	4.00	4.00	4.00			<mark>ዛ</mark> entreens, describings on entres 10 % No. 10 met perentition 10 %
그리 그들은 요그 그는 그 그렇지는 그는 그림을 하는 것이 없는 세계를 중요한 경우를 하는 사람이	ACS 51 FINAL	ACS 52 FINAL	HP 51 FINAL	SAIC ST FINAL	Verizon 52 FINAL BAFO Round	COMMENTS
aw and Justice Agencies Network and Voice Solutions Section 1	BAFO Round	BAFO Round	BAFO Round	BAFO Round	BAFU KOUNG	production of the control of the con
valuator 12		3				
valuator 23		3				
valuator 13		3				DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 24	The second	3				3
valuator 25		3				3
valuator 26		3.5				3
valuator 27		3			3.	5
valuator 28						DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 29		3.5			<u> </u>	3
Evaluator 14		3.5				4
Evaluator 20		3.17			3.2	
Average Score Rounded Score		3.00			3.0	The state of the s
		L ACS SZ FINAL		SAIC S1 FINAL	Verizon S2 FINAL BAFO Round	COMMENTS
Law and Justice Agencies Network and Voice Solutions Section 1.1	BAFO Round	BAFO Round	BAFO Round	BAFO Round		3
Evaluator 12		3				3
Evaluator 23		3	<b>-0</b> 00000000000000000000000000000000000		330	3
Evaluator 13						DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 24		3				3
Evaluator 25			- CATTOON 1 AND SOMETIMES			3
Evaluator 26		3.5	5			3
Evaluator 27	<del></del>					3
Evaluator 28			180			DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 29		3.5	5		3	3.5
Evaluator 14 Evaluator 20		3.5			<u> </u>	4
Average Score		3.1				17
Rounded Score		3.0	U			.00] #1 Harrate - Edward Stanfer - Colon Matter Line - Colon Matter Line - Colon Matter Line - Colon Matter Line - Co
	ACS S1 FINA	L ACS SZ FINAL	HP SI FINAL	BAFO Round	Verizon S2 FINA BAFO Round	COMMENTS
Law and Justice Agencies Network and Voice Solutions Section 1.2	BAFO Roun	d BAFO Round	BAFO Round	PACO ROund		3.5
Evaluator 12			3			3
Evaluator 23		10000	3		-	3
Evaluator 13						DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 24			3			3
Evaluator 25			3			3
Evaluator 26			.5			3
Evaluator 27			3			3
Evaluator 28						DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 29			.5			3,5
Evaluator 14 Evaluator 20		307(1000)	4			4
Average Score			22			3.22
Rounded Score			00	ing ngangganasan sesah sel		The second secon
- North Control (1985) - 1985 - 1985 - 1985 - 1985 - 1985 - 1985 - 1985 - 1985 - 1985 - 1985 - 1985 - 1985 - 1		IAL ACS 52 FINA	L MYSIFINAL	L SAIC S1 FINA d BAFO Round	BAFO Round	COMMENTS
Law and Justice Converged Network Management Service Requirements Accepta	nce BAFO Rou	nd BAFO Roun		u BAFU Round	DAFO ROUND	3
		[ ]	3.5			3
Evaluator 12			3		T 7	3
Evaluator 12 Evaluator 23			3			DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
			3			3
Evaluator 23 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 24			- 200/2000 CO			3
Evaluator 23 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 24 Evaluator 25			3		NNN	
Evaluator 23 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 24 Evaluator 25 Evaluator 26			3		1000	3
Evaluator 23 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 24 Evaluator 25 Evaluator 26 Evaluator 27			3			3
Evaluator 23 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 24 Evaluator 25 Evaluator 26 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 28						
Evaluator 23 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 24 Evaluator 25 Evaluator 26 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 28 Evaluator 28 Evaluator 29			3			3
Evaluator 23 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 24 Evaluator 25 Evaluator 26 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 28 Evaluator 29 Evaluator 29 Evaluator 14			3			DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
Evaluator 23 Evaluator 13 Evaluator 24 Evaluator 25 Evaluator 26 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 27 Evaluator 28 Evaluator 28 Evaluator 29			3 3			DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS 3

ow and Justice Converged VOIP Service Requirements Acceptance	ACS S1 FINAL BAFO Round	ACS S2 FINAL BAFO Round 3.5	HP S1 FINAL BAFO Round	SAIC 51 FINAL BAFO Round	Verizon SZ FINAL BAFO Round 3.5	COMMENTS
valuator 12			3			3
valuator 13			3			DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 24			J			BROFFED OOT DOE TO SCHEDOOM COMME
valuator 25			3			3
valuator 26			3		·	3
valuator 27		3.	5			3
valuator 28			3			DROPPED OUT DUE TO SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
valuator 29						3
valuator 14			3			3
valuator 20			3	The state of the s	3,0	6
Average Score		3.1			3.0	
Rounded Score		3.0	101			
	Scope 1	Scope 2	Scope 1	Scope 1	Scope 2	1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -
FINAL WEIGHTED SCORES	318.00 2	359.7 1	299.9 3	362.7 1	282.2 2	